Attachment in interaction

Schep, Ellen

DOI:
10.33612/diss.136734565

HOW PROFESSIONAL FOSTER PARENTS INITIATE BEHAVIOURAL CHANGE BY CORRECTING ADOLESCENTS IN FAMILY STYLE GROUP CARE

Abstract

In family-style group care, Professional Foster Parents (PFPs) provide care for out-of-home placed youngsters, often in addition to their own children. PFPs have the task of providing a safe base for these adolescents and simultaneously helping them to become (more) autonomous. It can be difficult for PFPs to achieve this balance, especially when it comes to rules and behavioural guidance. Learning how experienced PFPs direct adolescents by initiating behavioural corrections is therefore relevant.

In this study, Conversation Analysis (CA) was used to analyse video data showing dinner time conversations in six family-style group care settings. Analysis of these data shows that the corrections initiated by PFPs follow the three main grammatical sentence forms (also in Dutch): imperatives, interrogatives and declarative sentences. Each form provides the adolescents with a number of follow-up options. The different forms vary in the amount of space they leave adolescents for sharing their own opinions or ideas. With a view to building and maintaining a(n) (attachment) relationship with adolescents in family-style group care, acquiring knowledge about how these different corrections develop in interaction with adolescents is of great interest. Knowledge about this process can help PFPs to interact more consciously with adolescents in their family-style group care.

Keywords: Professional Foster Parents, family-style group care, Corrections, Adolescents, Attachment.

Introduction

In adolescence, the parent-child relationship changes towards greater equality and reciprocity and less dependence (Laursen, Coy, & Collins, 1998). Still, the attachment relationship with parents remains important, and permits and encourages adolescents to strive for autonomy (Bowlby 1979, Allen and Land, 1999).

Adolescents who grow up outside their own family have to deal with non-biological (attachment) relationships. They also often have troubled experiences in their relationship with their biological parents as well as other adults as a result of having moved from one place to another (Van Oijen, 2010; Sarti & Neijboer, 2011, Leloux-Opmeer, Kuiper, Swaab, & Scholte, 2017). Consequently, they frequently encounter greater difficulties in starting new relationships (Rosenfeld et al., 1997; Oosterman et al., 2007).

PFPs in 'family-style group care' are responsible for the upbringing of these out-of-home placed youngsters. PFPs need to support adolescents in becoming autonomous and to provide a secure base to fall back on (Bowlby, 1979; Kwaliteitscriteria Gezinshuizen, 2019 [Quality Criteria Family-style group care]). However, PFPs find it difficult to provide the right balance in protecting adolescents and encouraging exploration (Van de Koot & Schep, 2014). The developmental task of adolescents to explore seems conflict with the task PFPs have to be responsible for the safety of the out-of-home placed children (Van Oijen, 2010; Van de Koot & Schep, 2014). Moreover, due to the relational traumas experienced by these adolescents, they often show disturbed behaviour, making their relationship with PFPs quite vulnerable (Leloux-Opmeer et al., 2017). Correcting (disturbed) behaviour of adolescents in family-style group care needs to go hand in hand with the preservation of the relationship. This paper therefore focusses on video-recorded, naturally occurring PFP-adolescent interactions to discover how experienced PFPs initiate behavioural change by correcting adolescents. These interactions take place during and around dinner time and are analysed at the hand of Conversation Analysis (CA). CA is a form of ethnomethodological research which explores the social actions participants perform in interaction by examining the sequential unfolding of talk (Koole, 2015). CA enables us to study the video-recorded interactions in detail, and to observe the actual behaviour of PFPs and adolescents (Sidnell & Stivers, 2013).

In our data, PFPs use three different sentence types, which are in fact used in almost all languages for the correction of adolescents (Sadock & Zwicky, 1985): 1) imperatives, 2) interrogatives and 3) declaratives. These three forms differ in their claim to the right of behavioural correction, range from a relatively strong demand to a weaker demand. Thus, depending on the specific form of correction, adolescents are left greater or lesser degrees of space for sharing their own opinions or interpretations.

In what follows, we will first give an overview of the literature on interactions between PFPs and adolescents within the context of family-style group care and on corrections in social interaction. After discussing the methods and materials used in this study, we will move on to our analysis of PFP corrections in family-style group care. Finally, we will discuss our findings and the implications of our study.

Family-style group care

In growing recognition of the importance for children to grow up in a permanent environment, the Dutch government decided in 2014 that children who need to be raised in a residential youth care setting should first be placed in a foster family or in family-style group care (Ministry of Health, Welfare & Sport and Ministry of Justice and Security, 2014). A family-style group care setting comprises Professional Foster Parents (PFPs) and their biological children. Besides taking care of their biological children, PFPs in this family-style setting also take care of several out-of-home placed children (Wunderink, 2019; Ter Meulen, Vinke, De Baat, & Spoelstra, 2014). Despite the importance of placement permanency, many placements end prematurely, especially during adolescence (Van Oijen, 2010; Gardeniers & De Vries, 2012b). Breakdowns are commonly caused by a combination of risk factors leading to uncontrollable behaviour on the part of the adolescent. In such cases, the adolescents are no longer manageable by the PFPs (Van der Vliet, 2013). However, every breakdown increases the risk of the (re-) occurrence of behavioural problems (Oosterman et al., 2007). Increased knowledge about the practices of raising adolescents in family-style group care is therefore of urgent necessity.

Parent-adolescent relationship

As stated in the introduction, the relationship between a parent and a child changes during the transition from childhood to adolescence towards a more reciprocal relationship (Laursen et al., 1998). In this period of transition, parents need to keep some distance from the child, while still providing enough proximity. Too much parental control can lead to problems in adjustment to the stresses of adolescence, whereas less monitoring can lead to problematic behaviour and unsafety (Kerr & Stattin, 2000). PFPs typically have difficulty finding this balance (Van de Koot & Schep, 2014). One PFP (interviewed by Van de Koot & Schep, 2014) explains the dynamics, as compared to the situation involving her own children. She stated that because she knows the out-of-home placed adolescents less well compared to her own children, she limits them more (p.9)'.

The transition may be accompanied by tensions in the parent-adolescent relationship. In a parent-adolescent relationship with a history of sensitive and responsive interactions and a strong bond, tension causes no enduring problems. However, in relationships with a less positive history, communication difficulties can result in disruption or unresolved problems (Branje, Laursen, & Collins, 2012). According to the overview given by Leloux-Opmeer and colleagues (2017), children in family-style group care need help with regard to their attachment and trauma-related problems. They often exhibit problematic behaviour due to their troubled history (Leloux-Opmeer et al., 2017) and the resulting less positive history of sensitive and responsive interactions. This complicates the current parent-adolescent interaction. According to Allen and colleagues (2003), disagreement can work positively if parents and adolescents are able to stay connected while disagreeing on critical issues. When parents and adolescents succeed in using positive conflict resolution styles, conflicts can work as opportunities for adolescents to learn to negotiate or to achieve compromises (Branje, Van Doorn, Van der Valk & Meurs, 2009).

In light of the above, knowledge about how experienced PFPs initiate behaviour corrections with adolescents and how adolescents respond to these corrections is valuable. Analysis will also shed more light on whether or not negotiation and compromises are achieved in these interactions.

Corrections

The 'corrections' we analyse in this paper are different from 'corrections' as they are treated in the field of CA. Firstly, corrections (and repair) in CA address "problems in speaking, hearing, and understanding" (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977, p.361), while the corrections in this paper mostly address non-conversational behaviour of the adolescents. Secondly, a distinction can be made between the party that performs the correction (the adolescent) and the party that initiates it (the PFP). In the current study, however, we will use the term 'correction' in the more colloquial sense of 'initiating a correction'. Accordingly, this paper will consider a PFP telling an adolescent 'don't eat with your hands' to be initiating a correction.

To our knowledge, little to no research has been conducted in CA on behavioural corrections of adolescents by parents. There is, however, some work on verbal parent-pre-adolescent conflicts during dinner in Italian families (Arcidiacono & Pontecorvo, 2009). These researchers found that a declarative statement is most often used by parents in accusing their child. In addition, Sterponi (2009) reported on the meaning and functions of accounts in parent-child interactions. She found that when parents ask for an account, the children are held responsible for their behaviour. A recent study by

Potter and Hepburn describes admonishments of children by their parents. They show that the interrogatives used by parents ('what are you doing?', 'what did I say?' and 'why are you doing it?') do several things in interaction. They treat the child as a conscious person who has to account for its behaviour or to defy the response requirements options of an interrogative (Potter & Hepburn, 2020).

In this study, we focus on corrections by PFPs of adolescents in their care. In our data, we found corrections to be formulated as described by Sadock & Zwicky, that is, assuming the three main sentence types used in approximately all languages (Sadock & Zwicky, 1985): 1) imperatives, 2) interrogatives or 3) declaratives. These three forms differ in the amount of 'deontic authority' they claim (Stevanovic, 2011). Deontic authority refers to a speaker's rights to determine the other's future behaviour (Rossi & Zinken, 2017).

An imperative correction (e.g., 'Stop it') directs the recipient to do something, or rather to stop doing something. Moreover, it can '*also retrospectively treat the recipients as accountable for their current actions or inaction*' (Kent & Kendrick, 2016, p. 2). A sentence that is imperatively formulated conveys a steep deontic gradient. This means that the imperatival form (e.g., 'Stop it') has a strong claim of deontic authority; the speaker presents the correction in a very direct way, leaving less choice left for the recipient to have another opinion (Stevanovic, 2011).

Corrections performed by using an interrogative form (e.g., 'Why don't you clean up the mess?') (Zimmerman, 1984) give recipients more 'space' to either accept or refuse to correct their behaviour. Furthermore, this particular form invites recipients to give information (see Heritage & Raymond, 2012). The interrogative correction claims a less strong stance on deontic rights (Stevanovic, 2011), and gives the adolescent the opportunity to provide the requested information and as such to give an account or explanation. However, in the case of corrections, a preferred answer is sometimes resistance towards the correction itself. When an adolescent gives a preferred answer to the question (e.g., 'why don't you clean up the mess?'), it shows resistance to the action it implies (i.e., a request to clean up the mess).

Finally, when speakers provide corrections that are formulated declaratively (e.g. 'you didn't clean up'), they produce a claim or statement to evoke an account or declaration of the co-participant (Englert, 2010). By giving an account or declaration, however, the adolescent does not have to comply with the parent's admonition. With a declarative sentence, '*the speaker claims a relatively weak deontic stance: it is entirely up to the recipient to sort out the implications that the speaker's utterance has on the recipient's own future actions* (Stevanovic, 2011, p. 25).

With all corrections, a speaker directs the (non-)actions of the other (Kent & Kendrick, 2016), yet each form of correction offers different interactional follow-up

options. A correction has different layers in it; it is grammatically performed, giving it different follow-up options. For instance, 'why don't you clean up the mess?' is designed as an interrogative, and asks for an account that includes why-information (Bolden & Robinson, 2011). However, it also performs an action: stop making a mess / explain why you didn't clean up your mess. In our analysis of corrections provided by PFPs to correct adolescents' behaviour, we show how the form used (i.e., imperative, interrogative or declarative) gives greater or less space to adolescents for determining their response.

Methods

To obtain insight into the corrections performed by PFPs in family-style group care, we used Conversation Analysis. This method enables us to study in the details of interaction (Sidnell & Stivers, 2013) how corrections are formatted and how they function in the interaction.

CA is characterized by the use of audiotaped or videotaped data to analyse natural settings, in everyday and institutional (that is, goal-oriented) environments. Video data can be watched as many times as necessary, which helps the analysis of both verbal and embodied behaviour of participants within conversations.

Our data was obtained from six Dutch family-style group care settings. The six families were selected using several criteria and proposed by the staff of two youth care organisations. The families were employed or registered by one of these organisations. They needed to have one or more adolescents placed in their home, at least one successful placement (i.e., an adolescent had left the home when s/he was 18 years old) and a PFP with a bachelor's degree or higher. In these six households, cameras ran every day from 4 p.m. to 7 p.m. for 21 days, amounting to approximately 300 hours of video recordings. A camera was placed in a fixed position in the dining room for three weeks. The video recordings were all made without interference from researchers. The PFPs and adolescents signed an informed consent prior to the start of the recording period.

To locate relevant fragments, 40 hours of the videotaped conversations were watched, three days for each family-style group care. Fragments in which PFPs correct adolescents or teenagers were then selected. Since we saw no reason to suppose that adolescents respond differently to the sentence formats than teenagers do, we also included fragments in which teenagers are corrected. This inclusion gives greater insight into the interactional consequences of the three forms. In this study, corrections were identified as instances where the PFP tells the adolescent or child that they are doing something they are not allowed to do, or did not do something they should have done. The result was 67 examples of corrections initiated by PFPs. Based on these examples, we made an overview of the variety in the corrections, which led to the distinction

between three different forms we illustrate in this study. During the analysis, we went back and forth between the data and the literature. In addition, the different steps in the analysis were discussed in data sessions (with a group of conversation analysists) and by the authors of this chapter. The conversations were transcribed according to the conventions developed by Jefferson (2004, see Appendix B). All examples used for publication were translated into English. Names of families and children have been anonymized.

Analysis

In the interactions during and around dinner, we observed three main practices used by PFPs when correcting adolescents. They perform corrections by using 1) an imperative, 2) an interrogative or 3) a declarative. Table 1 offers an overview of the corrections and the number of fragments per type of correction.

Table 1. *Overview of corrections by Professional Foster Parents*

Corrections	Number
Imperative	26
Interrogative	20
Declarative	21
All initiations	67

Corrections formatted as imperatives

In our data, all corrections formatted as an imperative target behaviour that is immediately correctable by the adolescent. Imperative corrections give the adolescents the follow-up options to either accept or decline to correct their behaviour. The examples in our collection show that almost all of the corrections in this category are accepted by the adolescent without resistance. Only a few corrections evoke resistance, caused by disagreement about whether or not the correction was justified. We will give one example where the adolescent immediately accepts the correction, and a second one in which the adolescent shows resistance.

In excerpt 1, we see a correction formatted as an imperative, targeting the correction of immediate behaviour. In this example, the family is sitting around the table and has just finished a board game. An argument breaks out as to whether Aaron could have won the game instead of the actual winner. The Professional Foster Father (PFF) makes

a re-calculation to see if Aaron has made a mistake. While he counts (line 1), Anna interrupts with a loud voice (line 2).

Excerpt 1

Family-style group care *5, 21-01-2014, 3: 07:16-07:40*

PFF= Professional Foster Father, Anna = 13-year-old, Aaron = 9-year-old.

```
          >>------everyone gazes towards Aaron's game board-------
    pff   >>------gazes towards Aaron's game board ---------------
1   PFF   {één zes ↑ne::e=
           one six no
    pf    --------------points at game board----------------------
    anna  -------------gazes towards Aaron's game board ----------
2   Anna  =JAWEL (.) AAREN KON ↓UIT=
          oh yes (.) Aaron could have won
          >>------everyone gazes towards Aaron's game board of ---
    pff   ------------gazes towards Aaron's game board -----------
3   PFF   =s{sj sshh °schreeuw niet zo°
          shh sshh don't shout like that
    pff    {raises hand towards Anna-----------------------------
4         (.)
5   Anna  °uhuh°
          ----------gazes towards Aaron's game board -------------
6   PFF             °schreeuw niet zo°
    pff   ------------------------,,,
```

In line 3, the PFF raises his hand and simultaneously says: *'ssh sshh don't shout like that'*. All that time, his gaze is directed towards Aaron's game board. Anna immediately corrects her behaviour by saying 'uhuh' with a softer voice than she was using before (line 5). The correction formatted in an imperative form *'don't shout like that'* is therefore immediately followed by corrected behaviour.

As noted, the examples in our collection show that almost all of the imperative corrections are accepted by the adolescents without resistance. The corrections that do evoke resistance are those in which the PFP, in the adolescent's perspective, has misunderstood the corrected behaviour. In the following excerpt, a PFP is correcting Sebastian for messing around with apple sauce (line 1): Sebastian don't mess around'. Sebastian responds with resistance in line 2.

Excerpt 2

Family-style group care 2, 08-11-2013, 4: 11:58-12:20

PFF= Professional Foster Father, SEB = Sebastian, 11-year-old.

1	PFF	Sebastiaan niet zo knoeien joh
		Sebastian don't mess around
2	SEB	ik KNOEI niet
		I'm not messing
3		(1.5)
4	SEB	ik KNOEI niet
		I'm not messing
5		(0.7)
6	PFF	er zit ↑appelmoes ee:eh °voor je°
		there is apple sauce eh in front of you
7		(0.4)
8	SEB	ik ↑zit niet appelmoes te knoeien.
		I'm not messing with apple sauce
		((PFF {nods while he is chewing food))
9	PFF	{ok
10	SEB	waar zit ik ↓appelmoes te knoeien.
		where am I messing with apple sauce
11	PFF	ik zag iets naar beneden vallen (.) maar goed ik weet
		I saw something fall but well I don't know
12		niet of dat appelmoes was of een stuk (krenten)bol,
		if that was apple sauce or a piece of (currant) bun

Immediately after the correction, Sebastian responds with resistance: 'I'm not messing'. And after a silence, he repeats his utterance in line 4: 'I'm not messing'. The father reinforces his correction with an argument, pointing out that there is some apple sauce in front of Sebastian. When Sebastian responds with repeated denials, the father says 'okay', while nodding (line 9) and in line 11: 'I saw something fall, but well I don't know if that was apple sauce or a piece of currant bun' (line 11). With 'okay' and with his words in line 11, in which he admits that he might have been mistaken, the father seems to abandon the correction. After this utterance by the PFF, the conversations ends.

Multimodality

In this study, our primary focus was on the grammatical construction of the corrections uttered by PFPs. Although this seems to be the major factor in the performed action responsible for the addressee's response options, it is important to underline the co-determining factors (see also Arcidiacono & Pontecorvo, 2009). "Gesture, gaze, facial expressions, body movements, body postures and also prosody and lexis are all resources that can be mobilized by a participant to organize an action" (Mondada, 2016, p3). Within CA this is called *multimodality*. In the first example (in Excerpt 1), we saw a correction formatted as an imperative. In this example (see Excerpt 3), the PFF says: 'sshh don't shout like that' and simultaneously raises his hand in Anna's direction as a sign to stop. The word 'shout' is spoken emphatically.

Excerpt 3

```
3   PFF    =s{sj sshh °schreeuw niet zo°
           ssj sshh don't shout like that
    pff      {raises hand towards Anna----------------------------
4          (.)
5   Anna   °uhuh°
           ---------gazes towards Aaron's game board of ---------
6   PFF              °schreeuw niet zo°
    pff    ------------------------,,,
```

These different factors are mutually intertwined, and according to Mondada (2014) there is no principled priority for one type of resource over the others. However, in this study we base our analysis on a grammatical premise since we are interested in the response options provided by the different grammatical formats.

Corrections formatted as interrogatives

A second correction form used by PFPs is the interrogative. Although the correction invites the addressee to adapt their behaviour, the interrogative form also invites the adolescent to give specific, type-conforming information (Raymond, 2003), that is, the information requested according to the form of the interrogative. Corrections formatted as why-interrogatives can therefore work as invitations for adolescents to share the motives for their behaviour. Thus, interrogative corrections initiate an action to correct the targeted behaviour and ask for information. This is what Schegloff (2007) calls a

double-barreled action. In most cases, the adolescent responds to the form of the correction and provides the type-conforming answer. However, as such the adolescent resists the initiated action: to correct or admit his or her undesired behaviour.

The following excerpt (4) shows an example of a 'polar question'. Prior to the interaction, the PFF has just corrected another adolescent, Ruth, for using her smartphone during a family moment. Immediately after this correction, Kas interjects with: 'yes I think that is mean'. The PFF responds in overlap with Ruth (line 4) in line 5 with a correction formatted as an interrogative: 'Did I ask you something Kas?' Kas responds to the interrogative by saying 'No'.

Excerpt 4

Family-style group care 6, 10-03-2014, 13: 10:10-14:50

PFF = Professional Foster Father, KAS = 15-year-old, Ruth = 14-year-old, JUR = Jurren, 15-year-old.

	Pff	-----gazes towards Ruth, then towards Kas----------
1	PFF	ja maar volgens mij zijn we nu [wat aan het drinken
	Kas	----------gazes towards PFF----------
2	Kas	[ja ik vind het wel gemeen
		yes I think that is mean
3	RUTH	ja maar het duurt te lang we zijn al een half uur of zo (.)
		yes but it's taking too long – half an hour or so already
	Pff	----------,,,
4		[vijventwintig minuten of zo
		or twenty-five minutes or something
	Pff	,,,----------gazes towards Kas----------
5	PFF	[had ik jou wat gevraagd kas ((kijkt naar Kas))
		did I ask you something Kas ((gazes towards Kas))
	Kas	,,,----*glances at PFF*---,,,
6		*(2.0)*
	Kas	,,,--glances towards PFF),,,
7	KAS	nee
		no
	Pff	,,,--------gazes towards Kas---,,,
8	PFF	oh waar bemoei je je mee dan,
		oh so why are you interfering then

```
    Kas   --gazes in the direction of the television----------------
9   KAS   ((gazes away))
10  JUR   ik heb de hele dag er nog niet op gezeten
          I didn't use it all day
```

In this excerpt, several things are going on at the same time. The television is on (as the recurring family moment every evening: drinking coffee together and watching the news), there is a conversation with Ruth but simultaneously also an interaction with Kas. In line 3, the PFF performs a correction formatted as an interrogative in overlap with an utterance by Ruth. This interrogative has two interactional follow-up options: yes or no. Kas answers the question in line 7 with 'no'. With this answer, Kas aligns with the interrogative format but not with the correction, since further on in the conversation between the PFF and Ruth (as we can also see in fragment 9), Kas steps in again.

A second fragment (Excerpt 5) shows another interrogative correction. While all family members are sitting around the table for dinner, adolescent Richard enters the dining room through the back door. The PFF immediately asks: '*where have you been'* in line 1. Richard answers with a type-conforming answer, providing the requested where-information: '*I went with Willem'*.

Excerpt 5

Family-style group care 4: GH4, 13-01-14, 1, 11.59-16.46

PFM = Professional Foster Mother, RICH = Richard, 16-year-old.

```
1     PFM   waar kom jij vandaan
            where have you been
2     RICH  van Willem wegbrengen
            I went with Willem
3     PFM   mocht jij met Willem spelen?
            were you allowed to play with Willem?
4     RICH  weet ik niet
            I don't know
5     PFM   maar mocht jij ergens naar toe?
            but were you allowed to go anywhere
6     RICH  Nee
            No
                      (a few lines omitted)
7     PFM   en wat gebeurt er voordat dat ie- er dan iemand komt,
```

```
            and what happens before someone comes
8           (2.0)
9     RICH  dan belt die
            they phone first
10    PFM   ↑oh
             oh
11    RICH  ben ik vergeten
            I forgot that
```

It was unclear to us whether the PFF already knew where Richard had been. Nevertheless, he asks the question 'where have you been', and Richard provides the requested information. This response to a where-interrogative seems to be in line with the findings of Hepburn and Potter (2020) on why-interrogatives; the interrogative 'where have you been' gives the adolescent the opportunity to give an account for being late, but as a correction it also conveys that is it inappropriate to be late. Subsequently, the PFF uses different correcting interrogatives: '*were you allowed to go anywhere'* (line 5); *'And what happens before someone comes?*' (line 7). All the PFF's questions are answered without any resistance from Richard. By inviting Richard to answer, the PFF seems to refer to and remind him of the general rules (or the specific rules agreed upon with Richard).

Corrections formatted as declaratives

The third way in which PFPs may initiate behavioural correction is by the use of a declarative form. In excerpt 6, all family members are having dinner, except adolescent Karolien and her PFM (who is still at work). Karolien enters through the back door and says: 'hi'. Her PFF immediately responds with: 'Karro good that you're here but I'm very angry'. Karolien says 'yes' in overlap, and adjacent to the utterance of the PFF she answers: 'I know' (line 4).

Expert 6

Family-style group care 1, 06-11-2013, 3, 13.18-14.40

PFF = Professional Foster Father, KAR= Karolien, 16-year-old, BO = the dog.

```
1     KAR     hoi
              hi
2     PFF     Karro[goed dat je d'r bent maar ik ben wel heel boos
```

Karro good you're here but I'm very angry

3	KAR	[ja
		Yes
4		weet ik
		I know
5	PFF	ik snap niet dat je dit kan mak[en] ten opzichte van Bo
		I can't understand how you could do that to Bo
6	KAR	[nee]
		no
7		ja
		yes
8	PFF	en ook ten opzichte van het eten ben ik ook niet echt
		and I'm not happy about dinner
9		blij ( )(.)dus ik heb wel uh (.) een aantal
		either ( ) so there are uh some
10		consequenties hier tegenover staan (.) laat ik maar
		consequences for this let me be
11		gewoon meteen heel duidelijk zijn je gaat zo direct
		just very clear at once, in a minute
12		Bo uitlaten
		you're going to walk Bo
13	KAR	ja
		yes
14		(.)
15	PFF	ik wil jouw telefoon vandaag
		I want to have your phone today
16	KAR	ja
		yes
17		(.)
18	PFF	en ik wil (.) dat je morgen Bo ook gaat uitlaten
		and I want you to walk Bo again tomorrow
19	KAR	ja
		yes

The correction by the PFF has a declarative format. In this statement, the father claims to be angry even though he does not act angrily. He uses the same quiet tone of voice

throughout the entire turn. Karolien agrees (or at least claims agreement) with him several times (line 3, 7, 13, 16 and 19) by saying 'yes'. 'Arriving home too late' is not immediately correctable, nevertheless the consequences can be accepted and followed up directly after the correction. Even though Karolien already admitted she was wrong at the first occasion, the PFF announces several consequences, which are all accepted by Karolien. After summing up the consequences, the PFF asks Karolien: '*so I don't know if you have any other good reason for this'* (Excerpt 7, line 17). Karolien answers in overlap, with a question: 'do you want to talk to me this evening'. She adds that she has already wanted to speak to her PFF for a long time, but just did not dare to do so (line 21).

Excerpt 7

16		(2.0)
17	PFF	dus ik weet niet of je er verder nog een goede reden
		so I don't know if you have any other good reason for
18		voor hebt dat 't huis[werk af moet
		this that your homework still has to be finished
19	KAR	[nee maar (.) wil
		no but do
20	PFF	snap ik
		I understand
21	KAR	je misschien vanavond met mij praten over ik wil echt
		you perhaps want to talk with me tonight about it, I
22		dingen zeggen maar ik durf het gewoon al zo lang niet en
		really want to say things but I haven't dared to for such a long time and
23		snfff en ik merk dat ik alles ga opkroppen en dat ik niet
		snfff and I feel I am bottling up everything and that I
24		meer thuis wil komen omdat ik bang ben (.) snfff
		don't want to come home because I'm afraid
25	PFF	nou is prima (.)
		that's fine
26	KAR	Hhh
27	PFF	ik vind het prima om er vanavond over te praten (.)
		for me it is fine to talk about it tonight
28		volgens mij hoef je nergens bang voor te zijn (.)
		I don't think you have anything to be afraid of

In line 25, the PFF responds to Karolien's request by saying: '*that's fine*'. He adds that he wants to speak with her tonight, and that 'I don't think you have anything to be afraid of'. After this agreement, they continue the conversation about the consequences of arriving home late. In general, a declarative elicits a response of *receipt*. In this case, however, the response to the declarative of the PFF is immediate *agreement* by Karolien.

The second example shows that a correction formatted as a declarative evokes resistance. This interaction takes place while the family is having dinner. Karina starts a telling directed towards her PFM by calling her name: 'Jasmine' (not included in the transcript). She tells her about a conversation she had with her brother (who may be living with their biological mother, although this is not clear). Her brother told her that he did not get a gift at the Saint Nicholas Party, while the other children at the party had all received big gifts. She was very sad for her brother. As a kind of conclusion she says: *'but I think I will buy a little present for him'*. At first, the PFF responds with: '*oh that's nice'*. However, that does not seem to satisfy Karina, as she continues her telling. She goes on by saying: '*well I'll just say "here this is from Saint Nicholas"'*, and then the PFF poses a correction formulated as an imperative: *'Well you shouldn't do that at all'* (line 4). Karina does not agree, as we can see in line 7.

Excerpt 8

Family-style group care 3, 06-12-13, 6, 12.07-13.12

KARI = Karina, 17-year-old, PFF = Professional Foster Father, PFM = Professional Foster Mother, CLAU = Claudia, 14-year-old.

1	KARI	maar ik ga denk ik voor hem een cadeautje kopen=
		but I think I will buy a little present for him
2	PFF	=oh dat is fijn
		oh that's nice
3	KARI	nou maar gewoon dat ik zeg hier dit is van Sinterklaas
		but I'll just say here this is from Saint Nicholas
4	PFF	nou dat moet je dus gewoon helemaal niet doen als je
		well you shouldn't do that at all, if you
5		geen ruzie wil maken thuis dan zou ik dat maar niet doen
		don't want to start an argument at home then I wouldn't do that
6	KARI	dat zeg ik toch gewoon dat hoeft mama dan toch niet te weten
		I'll just say mama doesn't have to know about it
7	PFF	ja maar dat gaat ie toch echt wel vertellen dat moet je
		yes but he will certainly tell her anyway, so you just

8		juist helemaal niet doen
		shouldn't do that at all
9	CLAU	dan zeg je
		then you say
10	PFF	daar moet je je gewoon helemaal niet mee bemoeien (.)
		you simply should not interfere with that at all
11		koop dan maar een cadeautje voor mij
		buy me a present instead

In this example, we see how the PFF makes a correction by the use of a declarative: '*Well you shouldn't do that at all'* (line 4). Giving unsolicited advice is often seen as delicate (Goldsmith, 2000), but the PFF does not make use of delicacy markers in his correction. The PFF's priority seems to be to correct her intended plan, and not in the first place to have a conversation about her feelings and intentions regarding the situation. In lines 10-12, the PFF points out that her brother will pass her plan on to her mother, adding that he does not want her to interfere. In lines 3 and 6, Karina produces counter arguments as to why she does not agree with the PFF. It is not clear whether Karina will change her intended plan, but in this interaction she stops talking about the matter and the interaction ends.

The use of a combination of different forms

The final excerpt offers an example of the use of different forms for correcting adolescents. In general, participants respond to the last of the successive utterances, which is preferred for achieving contiguity in interaction (Sacks, 1987). However, in the following example, the use of different successive corrections leads to interactional trouble, and as a result the focus of the correction comes to be not on the undesirable behaviour but on the interaction itself.

Excerpt 9 displays the correction of Kas by his PFF. This interaction takes place in the same setting as excerpt 4, that is, during a coffee moment following dinner. In this situation, adolescent Fleur is using her phone and the PFF reminds her of the 'screen-rule'. Adolescent Kas interferes in their interaction and expresses his opinion that the rule is mean. The PFF responds with a correction expressed in different forms. He ends with a declarative form in lines 3 and 4.

Excerpt 9
Family-style group care 6, 10-03-2014, 13, 18.30-end
PFF = Professional Foster Father, KAS = 15-year-old.

1	PFF	hey Kas wat was je bedoeling eigenlijk net om je d'r
		hey Kas what did you mean just now by
2		mee te bemoeien waarom waarom doe je dat eigenlijk (.)
		interfering – why why do you do that actually
3		ik heb tot TWEE KEER TOE heb ik je gevraagd om je d'r
		I have asked you twice now not to
4		niet mee te bemoeien en toch doe je het ELKE KEER WEER
		interfere and you still do it every time
5	Kas	ja
		yes
6		(8.0) ((PFF gazes towards Kas, Kas gazes towards the
		television))
7	PFF	ik vraag iets aan jou
		I'm asking you something
8	Kas	ik zei ja
		I said yes
9	PFF	da's geen antwoord op mijn vraag
		that is not an answer to my question
10	Kas	wat vroeg je dan
		what did you ask then
11	PFF	ik vraag wat is de bedoeling daarvan en jij zegt ja
		I'm asking what did you mean by doing that and you say
		'yes'
12		wat is dat een antwoord op de vraag
		how is that an answer to the question
13		((Kas laughs softly))
14	PFF	kun je wel schaapachtig lachen
		well, that's a sheepish laugh

In lines 1 and 2, the PFF asks two different questions. First, he asks Kas: 'hey Kas, what did you mean by (…)', and subsequently: 'why, why do you do that actually?' Between the two interrogatives, there is no possibility for Kas to answer the first interrogative. Without waiting for an answer, the PFF adds his personal experience of the situation formatted as a declarative: 'I have asked you twice now not to interfere and you still do it every time'. Kas says 'yes' in line 5, as an (interactionally) fitting response, a reaction to the last addition from the father. The PFF treats this as an inappropriate response. He explains why in line 9: *'that is not an answer to my question'*. Kas asks the PFF what the question was. In the preceding part (line 7-9), the interaction between the PFF and

Kas is not focussed on the undesirable behaviour, but on the interaction itself. This final excerpt is an example of the use of different forms for correcting adolescents. The successive corrections lead to interactional trouble, and as a result the focus is on the interaction itself. Kas here adheres to the interactional principle of 'preference for contiguity'(Sacks 1987) in order to respond to the final format used in PFF's turn, and thereby counters the action of correcting.

Conclusion and discussion

The current study aims to make explicit how PFPs initiate behavioural correction of adolescents. PFPs in family-style group care are responsible for the upbringing of these out-of-home placed youngsters. Due to the fragile nature of the relationship between adolescents and their PFPs, it is relevant to see how experienced PFPs make corrections and how these corrections work out in the interactions with the adolescents.

Three main practices of making corrections towards adolescents were identified. Their three grammatical forms correspond with the three major sentence types (Sadock & Zwicky, 1985): 1) imperatives, 2) interrogatives and 3) declarative sentences. Even though each format is used to correct the adolescent's behaviour (action), every form (grammatical design) has different interactional follow-up possibilities for a participant. Therefore, for each format, the deontic authority it claims is different (Stevanovic, 2011).

First, PFPs make corrections in an imperative form. These kinds of correction are often task-oriented, mostly targeting immediate behaviour (e.g. 'don't shout like that') which can be corrected immediately by the adolescent (by stopping shouting). With a correction formatted as an imperative, the adolescent is directed to either accept or refuse to correct his/her behaviour. An imperative correction claims a high degree of '*deontic authority*' (Stevanovic, 2011); the PFP presents the correction very directly and thereby leaves very little space for resistance. All corrections formatted as imperatives are presented without display of emotions, and are almost immediately accepted by the adolescents. Only in cases involving a difference in interpretation of the behaviour does the correction lead to resistance. This could be explained by what Curl and Dew (2008) call 'contingency'. Behaviour (immediately) targeted by imperative corrections seems to be less complicated/drastic to change than behaviour that is corrected by the other forms.

Secondly, PFPs make corrections in an interrogative form (e.g., Where have you been?). With this form, adolescents are invited to give specific information (e.g., a 'where-question' asks for information about a place). Adolescents are likewise directed to undertake an action: to either accept or refuse to correct their behaviour. The interrogative corrections communicate a lower stance on deontic rights (Stevanovic,

2011, p25); the adolescent has more possibilities to determine his or her own response. Interrogative corrections invite adolescents to share their motives for their behaviour. Simultaneously, giving the preferred answer (e.g., why-information provided in answer to a why-question) works as resistance to the correction itself. Almost all of these corrections are accompanied by emotional expressions by the PFPs and often also by the adolescent. This is what Schegloff (2007) called 'a double-barreled' action: the correction seems to be a question, but in the question it is quite clear what the adolescent has to change; it consists of an accusation charging that the preferred behaviour has not been implemented.

Thirdly, we observed corrections formatted as declaratives. With a declarative the PFP presents a claim about the corrected behaviour (e.g. 'you didn't shave'), which works as an invitation to give an explanation or account for the targeted behaviour. Most of the corrections formatted as declaratives target remote behaviour, which is not immediately correctable by the adolescent. Therefore, the declarative form invites adolescents in the case of remote behaviour to either admit or refuse to admit their behaviour. With a declarative correction, a parent communicates a relatively weak deontic stance towards the action of the adolescent, who therefore has a lot of space to determine their follow-up action. (Stevanovic, 2011). In our data, declarative corrections often receive responses of resistance, but are sometimes also accepted by the adolescent. The declarative form probably causes the adolescent to experience the possibility of sharing their own opinion or countering the claim of the PFP.

In our analysis of corrections provided by PFPs to correct the behaviour of adolescents, we showed how the form used (i.e., imperative, interrogative or declarative) offers greater or less amounts of space for adolescents to determine their response, which is relevant in the setting of the non-biological relationship between a PFP and an adolescent who needs their developmental space.

Not all interactions following a correction end in a solution. In some situations, the disagreement and/or conflict remains. As we outlined in the introduction to the present chapter, this does not have to be a problem for the adolescent-PFP relationship (Allen, Moore and Kuperminc, 1997). After all, conflicts can work as an opportunity for adolescents to learn to negotiate or make compromises (Branje et al., 2009).

With a view to building and maintaining an (attachment-) relationship with adolescents in family-style group care, knowledge regarding the way these different corrections work out in interaction with adolescents is of interest. In adolescence, PFPs need to provide a secure basis for the adolescents to fall back on and thereby to support them in becoming (more) autonomous (Bowlby, 1979; Kwaliteitscriteria Gezinshuizen, 2019 [Quality Criteria family-style group care]). What can we conclude with these perspectives in mind? The three forms of correction identified in this study

range from a relatively strong claim to entitlement to behaviour correction to a less strong claim to this right. This entitlement goes hand in hand with greater or less space for adolescents to share their own opinion or ideas. Our goal is by no means to prescribe a specific format for PFPs to use in specific situations. This study rather provides detailed information about the way different corrections work out in interaction with adolescents. Knowledge about this process can help PFPs to act with greater awareness in their interaction with adolescents in family-style group care.